

28th January 1929] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

any reason why this Bill should be taken up now to the prejudice of other Bills which have, in the usual course of things, should be considered earlier by us."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"Sir, I also associate myself with the remarks of my hon. Friend who has just now spoken. There is no reason why any preference should be given to this Bill. I have myself given notice of some Bills which I consider to be very urgent."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member will be quite in order if he moves that his Bills may be taken up first, after this motion is disposed of."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I do not see any reason why there should be any change in the order of business, and I oppose the motion."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"Sir, I also oppose the motion for this reason. There are very many other matters which are more important and more urgent. I do not see any reason for the anxiety of my hon. Friends who want to get through that Bill first, and who want that Bill, just like a war measure, to be treated as urgent, and that not even one day should pass without that Bill being passed. Apart from the merits of the case, it has been usual on former occasions for such Bills being rushed through. That is, perhaps, the reason why my hon. Friend, Mr. Kumaraswami Reddiyar, says that it is a non-controversial subject. It is not such a non-controversial matter as it is presumed to be. Perhaps this time the Bill will take up more time. The reason for saying that this is a non-controversial matter is that such Bills were passed very easily last time, because some of us could not be here and did not want to be here. It cannot be presumed that this is also a similar matter. It is a very important and big matter and it will take up more time. The Bill requires good consideration. Probably the House may decide that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee to see how many people will suffer under the provisions of this Bill, what advantages will be given to others, how those people who get advantages under this Bill are faring in the world, whether this Bill benefits in any way the tenants, and whether it benefits only the zamindars. Perhaps some of my hon. Friends want that the Bill should be passed without any word being said on its merits. Others may not have the same liberal and generous opinion. We have to consider all these points and I therefore oppose the motion for adjournment."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that items 1 to 18 in the agenda under sub-head (II) be postponed till item 19 is disposed of."

The motion was put to the House and lost.

## IX

### THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT (AMENDMENT) BILLS.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The Council was discussing a the amendment of Mr. Venkatapati Raju with regard to Bill No. 14 of 1927 to amend the Andhra University Act, 1925. The amendment that was under consideration was that of Mr. Venkatapati Raju as amended by Mr. Satyamurti. The amended amendment runs thus :—"For the words "in the town of Anantapur" substitute the words "in the headquarters of the University". That amendment is for the consideration of the House."

\* Please see pages 294—297 of the Council Proceedings, dated 10th October 1928.

[28th January 1929]

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" May I ask for a poll, Sir, on my motion ? "

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Too late."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Sir, there are other amendments to the amendment of Mr. Venkatapati Raju."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member points out that there are other amendments. I am aware that there are various amendments, printed in the Agenda, to the Bill of Mr. Venkatapati Raju. If the hon. Minister wants that his amendment should be taken up, there are various ways of doing so. One is to defeat the amendment of Mr. Venkatapati Raju; the other is to ask the permission of the Chair to move his amendment as an amendment to the amendment of Mr. Venkatapati Raju. The same course may be adopted by other hon. Members also."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Sir, I request your permission to introduce my amendment, to substitute the word 'Vizagapatam' for the word 'Anantapur'."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before I proceed further, I should like to ascertain the wishes of the House as to the procedure to be adopted for discussing the amendments. This amendment deals only with the question of a single centre or multiple centres. Multiple centres are attempted to be reduced to one centre. Therefore I think it is better at this stage to dispose of the question of having more centres or reducing three centres to one. Before I give a definite ruling, I should like to know the wishes of the House about the procedure to be adopted with regard to the amendments given notice of by hon. Members."

\* Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—" Mr. President, Sir, the principle of my Bill, as it was introduced into the House and as it is brought forward now before the House, is that all the activities of the Andhra University should be concentrated at the headquarters. I think that the procedure should be to dispose of first the question whether the activities of the University should be concentrated in one place or in several places. Then other questions may be taken up and decided upon. If it is decided that the activities should be confined to one place, then we can consider the question what that place should be. Therefore, I would suggest to hon. Members through you that the question of concentration may be decided first and that the question where the headquarters should be located may be taken up later."

\* Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—" Mr. President, Sir, in the matter of several localities that are proposed or suggested, there are different Bills and amendments to those Bills. The exact question before the House now is whether there should be concentration or no concentration. May I suggest that the different amendments which suggest several places for the location of the headquarters of the University may not be dealt with now? The question of principle, viz., concentration at one centre or plurality of centres, may be decided on the motion now before the House. My suggestion is that all amendments which suggest particular places may be dealt with in the other Bills. The question of principle whether it is to be only one centre or plurality of centres may be determined on the Bill of Mr. Venkatapathi Raju. That will be a better method and will lead to convenience."



28th January 1929]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ With regard to the suggestion of Mr. Ramasomayajulu I feel one difficulty. If the Council adopts the Bill of Mr. Venkatapati Raju, the question of multiple centres cannot be considered again in this session. If Mr. Venkatapati Raju's Bill is disposed of, the question whether it shall be a single centre or more centres will have been disposed of. If that Bill is thrown away, it will be open for the Council to continue to have the existing three centres or to add to the list of three centres. If it is agreed that the question of a single centre or more centres should be disposed of first, the Council may proceed to discuss the amendment of Mr. Venkatapati Raju now before the House.”

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Sir, I wanted to point out the same difficulty just now pointed out by you. If the proposal of Mr. Ramasomayajulu is accepted, we would be accepting the one centre principle. The question of headquarters is in clause (6). Clause (6) is for the consideration of the House now in this Bill. If we decide that the only centre shall be at the headquarters, then the question arises in connexion with the other Bills which deal with clause (3) as to which shall be that centre. The question of what shape the Andhra University should take has been under discussion off and on in this House for the last two years and the settlement that was arrived at by the House under the original Act itself has not been accepted by every one. The Government have tried their best to see whether any agreement can be arrived at between the various hon. Members of the Andhra country. But time and again the discussion of these Bills has been postponed because no such agreement has been arrived at. I think the time has come when we should take a step in the direction of settling this question as to where the headquarters of the Andhra University should be and whether the University should be of the unitary type with only one centre or of the affiliating type.

“ If hon. Members have read the communiqué that has been issued by the Madras Government they would have found out that the Government are in favour of developing one centre and I can say, the reason which impelled the Government to do this was that the money available at the disposal of the Government will not be enough to develop two or three centres, whereas the money available to Government would, I think, be sufficient to develop work at any one particular centre. Viewing the question from the standpoint of merely financial consideration and putting aside all considerations of the locality from which people come, we, as a Government feel that the best place where such development could take place in the Andhradesa is at Vizagapatam and that is because already at Vizagapatam there is a Medical College; there is also the Engineering School, which when the Andhra University is in a position to have an Engineering College will serve as a nucleus; and the Harbour works at Vizagapatam are being constructed now. In course of time the Harbour will become an accomplished fact and will serve as a place where marine engineering could be developed. The Bengal-Nagpur Railway, I believe, are going to bring their workshop to Waltair. That again will be another incentive for the development of Railway engineering at Vizagapatam. So, if we consider all circumstances, we find that Vizagapatam will be an ideal place for the development of all institutions in the University.

“ As I have said, there has been a great cry for the development of technological studies in our universities and one of the main objections

12-30  
p.m.

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

[28th January 1929]

taken when the Annamalai University Bill was before this Council was that we were reproducing a mere cultural university, and that there were many of this type in this country."

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" Quite so."

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I do not know who is the hon. Member that questions it. This is what I said : the opinion of this House was that the Government were in favour of technological institutions. I feel that Vizagapatam is in every way a suitable place for the location of the centre of this University and so I would implore this House to accept this amendment of Mr. Venkatapati Raju, which will make development possible only in one particular centre."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Is the hon. Minister moving an amendment ?"

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I am supporting Mr. Venkatapati Raju's amendment, Sir."

\* Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" Sir, with reference to the concentration or distribution of centres, I wish to submit that Dr. Subbarayan's Government has been solely responsible for creating the greatest confusion possible in the Andhra country and for having created an almost impossible situation for reaching any agreement at all. The previous Government kept in its view the public opinion of Andhadeva. Taking into consideration the vastness of the area and also the different kinds of necessities they have taken into their minds that the Andhra University should also be an affiliating University, besides being a teaching University, and therefore they did not think it possible to have one centre and wanted a federal type of University. Therefore they fixed Vizagapatam as one centre for developing itself in the womb in time to get a University, Rajahmundry as another centre and Anantapur as a third centre. Of course the question of a fourth centre also came up for consideration and in the Legislative Council ; Guntur was claimed by one party, Bezwada by another party, but if we take the figures at voting, we find that almost every one of the members of the Council voted for a fourth centre in one form or another, but as neither Bezwada nor Guntur was settled, the question of a fourth centre fell through, but the hon. the Chief Minister thought Bezwada being the most central place, would be suitable for the Andhra University and as the University has affiliating functions, it was fixed up as the headquarters of the University. After Ramarayaningar's Ministry failed in the last elections and after Dr. Subbarayan assumed the Chief Ministership, what has happened ? He set up one place against another ; he has created confusion. But we find that the Senate passed a resolution, asking the Government to make Bezwada the fourth centre. The previous Ministry knew the needs of the Andhra country much better than this Ministry and therefore they wanted a federal type of University and so they fixed Bezwada as the headquarters. They promised in their speeches in the Council made at the close of the passing of the Act, as also outside the House, that Bezwada would be made the fourth centre sooner or later. It was on that basis that the whole thing went. Then Dr. Subbarayan had no objection for Bezwada being continued as the headquarters of the University. There was a communiqué in 1927 stating that Bezwada would continue as the headquarters. They only wanted the



28th January 1929]

[Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao]

Rajahmundry should be deprived of its centre and that it should be transferred to Bezwada. That was the mind of the Government and that was the first kind of difficulty that they created. Of course, the Senate, following its old lines, passed a resolution unanimously that Bezwada should be made the fourth centre, because it would create heart-burning to remove one centre to another place. Of course, it is not obligatory on the part of Government to develop all the centres simultaneously, and therefore the headquarters should be made a centre. But the Government has option to develop headquarters first. It was with that idea that Mr. Lakkaraju Subba Rao proposed that Bezwada should be made the fourth centre. The Vice-Chancellor of the University also accepted it and communicated it to the Government, but the Government said 'No' and said that there should be only three centres, as if there was some charm in having three centres; but at the same time, they said that Bezwada should continue to be the headquarters. After that there was interminable controversy between Rajahmundry and Bezwada, Bezwada struggling to retain the headquarters and Rajahmundry struggling to retain the centre. That is the first stage.

"Then, Sir, several Bills were introduced, and then the question was referred to the Senate by the Government asking for their opinion. The Senate said that Anantapur should be the headquarters—of course it may be under different circumstances, on account of agitation carried on by one party. The Government did not accept the opinion of the Senate. That was the next stage.

"Then, Sir, the matter came up before the Select Committee and they said that there should be concentration at Anantapur and that Anantapur should be the headquarters of the Andhra University. Then Government again said 'No'. Then last September when the Andhra University Bills came up for consideration, Dr. Subbarayan put in an amendment in favour of Rajahmundry being made the headquarters. He did not think of Vizagapatam and its excellent climate then and the possibility of developing technological studies at Vizagapatam. That is how the mind of the Government was wavering then. Then, Sir, I proposed an adjournment of the consideration of the subject for three months. I distinctly told the Government that our local bodies in both the Kistna and Guntur districts were going to contribute 14 lakhs and another lakh would be collected from zamindars. Important zamindars like the Zamindar of Vuyyur, the Zamindar of Mirzapuram and the Zamindar of Gollapalli signed the manifesto. Then Dr. Subbarayan said that he would give a chance to local bodies to collect these funds. We went to our homes and, keeping the objects in view, we passed resolutions granting some lakhs to the University: the Bezwada Municipality wanted to pay four lakhs, Guntur District Board five lakhs and the Kistna District Board reiterated its promise of three lakhs. Then Dr. Subbarayan wavered again and came with his Government Order prohibiting the district boards and municipalities from paying such large contributions to the university. That was the next stage in the psychology of this Government. We never said that we would collect the 15 lakhs from private gentlemen. At that time we said that there was no Annamalai Chettiyar in the Telugu country and so it was natural for local bodies like Guntur and Kistna to pay. Now, the Government has completely changed

[Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao]

[28th January 1929]

12-45  
p.m.

its mind and upset its own policy, and Dr. Subbarayan comes forward with a communiqué. That communiqué says that the Andhra University should be scrapped, i.e., all the institutions should go back to the Madras University, and that there should be only a unitary type of university—it may be called the Waltair University or the Vizagapatam University. Now he has changed his mind and by the time we come before this Council he has given up the idea of sending us back to the Madras University. So, is this House to follow the lead of Dr. Subbarayan when he has changed from step to step, when he has no fixed opinion, for at one time he wants Rajahmundry, and then sets Bezwada against Rajahmundry, Anantapur against Bezwada and now he sets Vizagapatam against all these. I therefore appeal to this House not to follow the Government in this matter. I had my own ideas about concentration and now seeing the whole situation and the public opinion in the country I think it is necessary to keep all these centres and to make Bezwada the fourth centre. That would only keep up the dignity and prestige of the old Government. As soon as Ministers change, the principles of the old Act should not change. The old Ministry was an Andhra Ministry and they knew the public opinion in the Andhra country. But Dr. Subbarayan having no fixed ideas has created all this confusion in the country. I would therefore appeal to the House to make Bezwada the fourth centre and remove the heart-burning from Rajahmundry, Vizagapatam and Anantapur. Keep the headquarters at Bezwada. Do not deprive Bezwada of its headquarters. So long as the affiliating functions of the university are to be retained, the centrality of the place becomes very important because people have to come to a single place for the transaction of business, and commissions have to go from a central place to examine the various colleges to see that the existing colleges are in a good condition. Students and parents have to go to the Registrar and so the centrality of the place becomes an important matter. If the climate of Bezwada is considered hot in two or three months in the year, according to the expert opinion of a Medical College Professor of Vizagapatam, the climate of Vizagapatam is bad for nine months in the year. It is only in summer that it is excellent, but at that time all the colleges would be closed and all the professors would leave the place. On the other hand the climate of Bezwada is excellent for about ten months in the year, and Bezwada is a growing place and it is growing very rapidly. From a little union of 8,000 population, it has risen to a town with 50 to 60 thousand population, and the most important municipality in the Telugu country according to its income and practically according to population also. It is still rising by leaps and bounds. When we take the distances into consideration, Vizagapatam is in one corner; it is about 300 miles or so from Bezwada, and Anantapur is almost equi-distant from Bezwada. When we take the Nizam's Dominions into consideration, there are about 60 lakhs of Andhras there and their wants have to be taken into account. So I say that Bezwada should not be deprived of its headquarters and the lead of the Government should not be followed. With regard to technological and technical studies, there is no prohibition under the Act that they should be developed only in one centre."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think the hon. Member will have to take another opportunity to dwell upon the question of technological studies. Here we are only concerned with headquarters and concentration."



28th January 1929]

\* **MR. A. KALESWARA RAO** :—"When we take into consideration the public opinion as expressed in the oral and written evidence that was given before the Select Committee, we find that the preponderating evidence was in favour of Bezwada continuing as the headquarters either as the fourth centre or as the only centre. I do not want to disturb the other centres because it would create heart-burnings and needless quarrels. I am also afraid that after the next elections, while bricks and mortar are being carried to a particular place and walls are being raised, other amending Bills may crop up and disturb the whole thing, just as Dr. Subbarayan's unexpected Ministry has come and disturbed the whole thing built up by the previous Ministry of Raja Ramarayaningar. And Raja Ramarayaningar when we all met in Dr. Subbarayan's room said that if we want to give an all-Andhra character to the Andhra University, Bezwada should be the headquarters. He said so in so many words when all the Andhra members met, and therefore that was the opinion of Raja Ramarayaningar. I fervently appeal to Dr. Subbarayan to follow in the footsteps of the late Raja Ramarayaningar and keep up the prestige of the previous Council and the previous Government and the dignity of the Government and of the Council and not to waver by going this side or that side. I therefore think that the three centres should remain as they are now with Bezwada as the headquarters; and Bezwada should be a centre."

\* **MR. P. SIVA RAO** :—"Mr. President, Sir, I take it that the question now is whether there should be concentration or there should be distribution as provided for in the original Act, and I was merely sorry for my hon. Friend, Mr. Kaleswara Rao, who was waxing eloquent about the respective merits of Bezwada versus Vizagapatam, Vizagapatam versus Rajahmundry, Rajahmundry versus Anantapur, and so on. As you, Sir, gently and mildly reminded him, he would have an ample opportunity of discussing the relative merits of each place, and which is going to be the headquarters of this Andhra University. Before we do so, Sir, the first question that will have to be decided is this. According to clause (3) of section 6 of the present Andhra University Act, 'the University might establish a university college or a first-grade college or affiliate any institution as a university college or a first-grade college in the towns of either Vizagapatam or Rajahmundry or Anantapur or only at the headquarters of the University whichever place may be decided upon, etc.' Before discussing this matter, we have to answer the question whether the essential features of the present Andhra University Act should be wiped out because the hon. the Chief Minister all on a sudden develops a fad of a unitary teaching and residential type of university for the whole Andhra desa. Now, Sir, I may observe that the Bill of the hon. Member, Mr. Venkatapati Raju, which proposes that there should be concentration of university colleges and first-grade colleges only at the headquarters was considered at the Select Committee meeting. It was a Select Committee numerously and very well represented and they came to the conclusion that whatever views may prevail in the case of the university colleges, so far as the first-grade colleges are concerned, there should not be any restriction for their springing up anywhere else than in the centres themselves. And as regards the university colleges, the Select Committee recommended that they should be located at Anantapur because the Select Committee decided that Anantapur should be the headquarters. Now, if I attempt to answer the question as to whether there should be concentration

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

[28th January 1929]

at only a particular centre, that centre being the headquarters of the university, I most unhesitatingly say this 'Let the essential features of the present Act be preserved intact.' I may say, Sir, without dilating on the matter any further, that the essential features of the present Act are not a single unitary teaching and residential type of university provided for the whole of the Andhra desa, whether at Vizagapatam or at Anantapur. But its object was the simultaneous development of three centres—Vizagapatam, Rajahmundry and Anantapur. And I am strongly of opinion that those essential features of the present Act, namely, concentration, should be preserved. In the result, I oppose this amendment of the hon. Member, Mr. P. C. Venkatapati Raju, that there should be concentration of the university colleges and first grade colleges only at the headquarters of the university. I reserve to myself the liberty to discuss fully and elaborately the question of the location of the headquarters at the proper time."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I think I am right when I say that the majority of members of the select committee were in favour of having a unitary type of university for the Andhra districts. That is the only reason why they suggested that Anantapur should be the headquarters. There is already a Government college there and Government, I think, have spent about 5 to 7 lakhs on that college. The second reason was that the claims of the northern Andhra districts were amply satisfied and fully met by the institution of the technological institute at Vizagapatam. Thirdly, considering the vast area and the backwardness of the Ceded districts and the differences of opinion among the members of the committee, between those who advocated Rajahmundry and those that advocated Bezwada, the select committee gauged the whole position there and decided that Anantapur should be the headquarters of the university. Therefore in one corner of the Andhra districts within easy access of the Ceded districts was to be located the academic centre of the university and at the other corner the aspirations of all young men who want to have the best kind of instruction in medicine, engineering and technology would be quite satisfied by their being asked to go to Vizagapatam. If now Vizagapatam is recommended as the headquarters of the university both for liberal or cultural subjects and for technological subjects of education, I think the House is entitled to have some more information from the hon. the Minister. My friend Mr. Kaleswara Rao just now said that the citizens of Bezwada offered Rs. 15 lakhs. Whether it was merely a promise or whether the amount was actually collected and offered, I am not in a position to know. If the zamindars of the place had come out readily with a large amount, like Sir Annamalai Chettiyar, probably the hon. the Minister might have accepted the offer and voted for the present headquarters in the Andhra University Act being retained. When the hon. Minister says that financial considerations were at the bottom of this change, there are one or two conclusions possible. It might be the hon. the Minister contemplates a scheme whereby he proposes to utilize the services of the professors of engineering and technological institutions for the purposes of research work or higher studies. If that is so, it is a concentration which rests solely on financial considerations. If there is to be no such concentration or interchange of professors, i.e., the professors employed in the medical, engineering and technological institutes being also availed of for conducting and supervising



28th January 1929] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami; Udayar]

research work or higher studies in the academic part of the University, then there is really no reason why we should favour such a concentration of Honours and post-graduate courses. If, on the other hand, the promises to which Mr. Kaleswara Rao referred, namely, the promises of Rs 15 lakhs, are only on paper and not really in the shape of hard cash ready to be placed on the table of the hon. the Minister, and there is no prospect of any contribution from private sources, and Government has to shoulder the whole burden, then I do not see why the decision arrived at by the members of the Select Committee, by the majority of them, with regard to the separation of the cultural and technological branches of higher studies, should be disturbed."

\* Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—"I conceive, Sir, that the scope of the discussion has been transgressed by more than one speaker that preceded me. To begin with, I will have to name the hon. the Chief Minister himself. The Chief Minister, Sir, under the guise of supporting the principle of concentration at one single centre went on discussing, not the merits of that question, but the merits of Vizagapatam as satisfying all the requirements of that centre. I fail to see any arguments advanced by the hon. the Chief Minister that would lead this House to accept this theory of concentration at a single centre in preference to the division into three centres, as fixed by the Act as it stands.

"I am not going into the merits of the different places for being a centre, 1 p.m. but I am going to deal with the question whether this theory of concentration at one single centre and that at the headquarters is a thing which is new or whether it has been before the Council and the country and, if so, for how long. I may put before the House that this theory of a single centre and that at the headquarters was before the House and it was considered in all its aspects. Taking into consideration the vastness of the country that was to be within the ambit of the Act, taking into consideration the necessity for satisfying the intellectual needs of the vast population that has got to be served by this Act, and taking into consideration the desirability of separating the higher separable departments of culture, for instance, the humanities at one place and the sciences at the central place with a view to satisfy the needs of the whole province, it was thought the most desirable course to have what are called three university centres. The Council came to this opinion with a view to meet all the peculiar circumstances of the province that there should be three centres, one centre where the different sciences are to be developed, another centre where the humanities are to be developed and another centre which has got special facilities for developing technological studies. The ultimate aim of the Act is to develop two different universities for the whole Andhra area, which naturally divides itself into two natural divisions, namely, coastal districts and central or Ceded districts. It was in that view that Anantapur and Rajahmundry have been selected. Vizagapatam has been selected for the peculiar facilities it affords. The basis of the present Act is intended to be taken away by the present Government at a moment's notice. This idea of a unitary centre was before the previous Government and before the previous Ministry, a Ministry, as was observed by one of the speakers, which belonged to the Andhra Province. The Council is to consider the requirements of the Andhra Province and not to pander to the pet theory of the Chief Minister, namely, the one centre theory; he being an

[Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu] [28th January 1929]

Oxford man, he can take to that theory, but the Andhra people are not prepared to accept this one-centre business. The Andhra country asserted itself in no uncertain voice that it would not be satisfied unless it had facilities for two universities, one for the coastal districts and another for the Ceded districts. If in course of time, funds permitted, they may have two different universities, one at Anantapur, and one at Rajahmundry. So, there is absolutely no case made out to subvert the basic facts of the Andhra University Act and take to this one centre argument. Therefore, I strongly appeal to the House to pay heed to the voice of the Andhra country as indicated in the Council and elsewhere, and not subvert the whole basis of the Andhra University Act and not accede to the wishes of the hon. the Chief Minister. He has not made any convincing arguments in favour of the intended subversion of the whole fabric of the Andhra University Act. I am not going into a disputation about the claims of this locality or that; that will be settled later on. This fabric of the Andhra University Act ought not to be changed and no case has been made out for it."

\* Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" Mr. President, Sir, so much has been said about the Andhra public opinion in this House by several speakers that one is hard put to find out what that public opinion is, because we find advocates of Bezwada and Anantapur and in spite of all these months taken up over this question, they have not been able to come to any definite settlement. I think this question will be settled and settled well if the Andhra Members do not take any part in the discussion, and leave it to others to decide the things for them. They may blame the Government for many of the things in the past. Now that the Government have come to a conclusion, I think it is better they stick to it. I for one would give all my support to see that one full fledged university of the technological type is developed at one centre. As far as we outsiders are able to learn, Vizagapatam seems best, and with our little funds it is not possible to develop one headquarter at Anantapur, and another one at Bezwada wherein we have to spend several lakhs of rupees. Now we have a university in the south; the only point on which I do not agree with the communiqué is that it does not make any mention of industries or technology, but simply says researches in science and arts. If there is going to be another duplication of the Annamalai University, I do not think many members would like to have one more imitation of that university. If the Andhra University is going to supply the need of the Province in the matter of giving technological instruction, we would support it. I wish Government will stick to their guns and see that the Bill is passed in the manner indicated by the Chief Minister."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Mr. President, Sir, I am glad that after a course of vacillation, the Government have come to very sound conclusions which we have been reiterating on the floor of this House, and it is sheer wisdom to select the only important place in the northern districts, that is, Vizagapatam, which in course of time is bound to become a world centre of commerce. When introducing the Andhra University Bill, Sir Patro in no unmistakable terms said that the two essential principles on which the Andhra University was based were (1) the vernacularization and (2) development of technology. Going into the first question, I do not think why the House should agree to any unitary type of university having one centre at Vizagapatam, another at Rajahmundry and another at Anantapur. In the words of the distinguished Member of this



28th January 1929] [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

hon. House, who now has the privilege of adorning the Chair, I think we will have an aeroplane university, in which the members and professors will be accommodated to give lectures on various courses of study in different places. If that is not going to be the aim of this hon. House, I think we must make up our mind once for all to come to one conclusion, and that is to fix up a centre. My hon. Friend made out a case bringing so many different points on this question. I think so far as we are concerned, we have to discuss and decide now the only question, that is the headquarters of the University. If the hon. Members will coolly think throwing aside local interests they will certainly decide and prefer Vizagapatam to any of those centres proposed to be included within the Andhra University. I feel that my hon. Friends from Bellary would not press for it. My hon. Friend from Bezwada has put up a strong plea for Bezwada. I have no objection to any place if it is better than Vizagapatam. Under the circumstances, I very much welcome Vizagapatam and I welcome the wise policy that has been followed by Government in fixing Vizagapatam.

"Then a reference has been made to the local board contributions. So far as my reading of the Local Boards Act is concerned, I think no district board can contribute a pie out of its funds, unless the Local Boards Act is amended. I have not read the District Municipalities Act, but so far as the taluk board or district board is concerned, they cannot give one pie towards the funds of the University, for the promotion of collegiate education. There is no recommendation either in the findings of the Financial Relations Committee or any provision in the Local Boards Act to allow of such contributions.

"Then, Sir, a word about concentration. I do not think we would agree to a unitary type of university, with the affiliating functions left to the Madras University, for this reason. The Andhra University, as has been said, is intended mainly for the vernacularization of the courses and I feel that if the affiliating functions are left to the Madras University, the Madras University may not take that attitude and that course of action which might facilitate and also make the progress of vernacularization rapid. In these circumstances, I do object to the idea of affiliating functions being delegated to the Madras University. Under the present conditions, we cannot much harp upon the word 'unitary' and relegate the Andhra University to do the functions of a merely unitary type like Dacca University. With these observations I heartily support the idea of having the University headquarters fixed at Vizagapatam."

\* Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—"Mr. President, I repudiate the charge that the Andhra members here or the Andhra members outside could not come to a decision on this matter. I would place the blame wholly and solely at the doors of the present Government and the hon. the Minister for Education. It was he, Sir, who was in a measure responsible for tantalising Bezwada, Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam and even Anantapur. He could not possibly make up his mind till now. The latest development, however, seems to be that he has made up his mind that the centre should be Vizagapatam. As far as my friends from the Andhra desa are concerned, I am sorry, I will have to differ from some of them to some extent. The original idea of the Andhras was that there should be one Andhra province and one Andhra University. They fought for it. Perhaps they had not possibly a

[Mr. P. Anjaneyulu]

[28th January, 1929]

clear conception of the type of university they wanted. It was only when the Andhra University Act was passed and the subject was fully dealt with that the different types of universities came up for consideration. It was for the self-same reasons which are expressed to-day that a sort of compromise was reached to the effect that there should be more than one centre. Bezawada, Rajahmundry, Anantapur and Vizagapatam aspired to become centres. It was thought that the Ceded districts might be satisfied by having a centre at Anantapur, the coastal districts by having one at Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam by having a technological centre; Bezawada, considered as the neutral zone, being chosen for the headquarters. It was only a compromise and, as all compromises are defective, this compromise too has given rise to further complications. We repeated the old story to-day, i.e., having one centre at the back of our minds and trying to locate it as near our houses as possible. That is the trouble. The idea is that we must have only one centre. My hon. Friends seem to be afraid of having only one centre for the whole of Andhra desa. The Select Committee's report is very clear on the point. The Committee are in favour of concentration of all Honours and post-graduate courses at one centre only. It is only for Honours and post-graduate courses that one centre is to be selected. If we take practical affairs into consideration we will find that the students that will go in for Honours and post-graduate studies will be very few. According to Mr. Statham's report there would be about 50 to 60 students. To have more centres merely for fifty or sixty students is in my humble opinion unthinkable. To have university professors for twenty students at one place is very uneconomical also. Further it will defeat our very object, viz., to have a real living university centre for Andhra desa which would be an ornament to it.

"In the Select Committee the question of the claims of other districts were not left undecided. In this connexion I may say that education may be differentiated in two ways. One is cultural and the other is commercial. As far as the commercial side is concerned, we have provided that each district may be allowed to have a first-grade college affiliated to the Andhra University and we have also decided in the Select Committee that there should be only one centre. I shall not commit myself by saying where it should be. Whether it should be at Vizagapatam, or Rajahmundry or Bezawada or even our Guntur or Harpanahalli is immaterial to me. Let us as early as possible decide some centre and I am satisfied.

"One more word and I have done. My friends seem to think that in the whole of Andhra desa there is only one opinion. The amount of evidence received by the Select Committee would show that Vizagapatam wanted to be made centre on account of its salubrious climate, Bezawada on account of its central place and Anantapur on account of its being a backward tract and that all these claims were considered. Now, without going into the question of the location of the centre, I propose that we should concentrate our attention on the question of the number of centres. If the view that I have presented that post-graduate courses and Honours studies alone have to be concentrated at one place and that all other districts should be allowed to develop first-grade colleges under the existing Act, is accepted, I trust that the district ambitions would be satisfied and in God's good time if finances permit and if we have other facilities, we may think of raising the first-grade colleges into centres in future. I am heartily in favour of having one centre for post-graduate and Honours courses."



28th January 1929]

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, it is with a great deal of tensy that I, a mere non-Andhra, enter into a discussion on an amendment of this kind. I am anxious to say this only, that the House should clearly understand the scope of this amendment. This amendment is not in consonance with the Government communiqué, confining to Vizagapatam all the activities of the new Andhra University. This amendment seeks only to amend sub-section (3) of section 6 of the Andhra University Act. That sub-section merely provides that excepting in Vizagapatam, Rajahmundry or Anantapur or within 10 miles' radius thereof there shall not be established a university college or a first-grade college and that such a college shall not be affiliated. The provisions of sub-section (4) are not touched by this amendment. That sub-section confers upon the existing second-grade colleges, until 1931, the right to become first-grade colleges. I take it, speaking subject to correction, that the existing first-grade colleges at Rajahmundry and Anantapur will continue to be first-grade colleges, even if this amendment is accepted by this House. Therefore, the result of this amendment will be that there will be first-grade colleges in all the places where such colleges exist now and colleges, which are now only second grade, may become first grade within a period of two years from now. Therefore, the federal character of the university to that extent will remain unaffected. What the amendment of my hon. Friend from Vizagapatam seeks to achieve is that hereafter there shall not be established outside the headquarters of the University university colleges or first-grade colleges, that is to say, colleges which provide either for Honours or post-graduate instruction or colleges which provide for instruction to degree courses.

"My hon. Friend from Bellary referred to the Select Committee report on this matter. That Select Committee stated—I am indebted to my hon. Friend the learned Vice-Chancellor of the Andhra University who quoted it in the course of his remarks on this amendment at the last meeting of the Council—"The Committee are in favour of concentration of all Honours and post-graduate courses at one centre only since they consider that this concentration is essential both for the attainment of high standards of post-graduate and research work and for the most economical development of all classes of Honours courses excepting the courses in that college. They have therefore decided by a majority that this should be accepted."

"That was the report of the Select Committee on this Bill. Therefore I claim for my hon. Friend's Bill this merit, that all relevant and expert opinion on the matter is in favour of the concentration of Honours and higher post-graduate teaching in one centre and one centre only. As one who is somewhat familiar with the development of higher collegiate and university work of the Madras University, I am free to mention to this House that we feel considerably handicapped in that our Honours courses are spread over in three or four places. No doubt that is due to historical reasons. But if, to-day, we can remake the whole thing, I am sure expert opinion in the Madras University will be in favour of concentrating all Honours and higher teaching work at Madras or one place. No doubt there are centres developed already to a high degree in Honours. The Andhras have an advantage over us in this matter, in that they have not yet developed any Honours or post-graduate work anywhere. When they have that advantage over other people, should they not profit by the mistakes of others I ask in all humility? I think it is right that they should concentrate in one place until private

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[28th January 1929]

generosity comes to their rescue. Undoubtedly I do not see why the Madras Government which has been so generous to Chidambaram and Tamil districts should not be compelled to be equally generous to one centre in the Andhra desa. I do not see why it should not put down lakhs of rupees and develop a first-class university with provision in Honours subjects and in technological studies.

“I have only one word to add. Throughout the discussion a great deal has been said about the relative merits of particular places where this concentration work should be carried on. I think, Sir, the advantage of this amendment is that it gives this House a clear opportunity of pronouncing on the logical aspect of the question as the learned Vice-Chancellor called it apart from the local aspect of the question. Let the headquarters be either Anantapur or Rajahmundry or, if you please, Bezwada or Vizagapatam. It does not matter. The straight and simple question is whether this House is in favour or not, of the well recognized academic principle of higher collegiate and university development, to the extent to which we can guarantee such development to be concentrated in one place where with the co-operation of Government, philanthropic bodies and local bodies we can give the highest type of post-graduate and Honours education to the youths of the Andhra districts. That is the simple question, and I do appeal to my Andhra friends and others to rise above all local feelings in the matter, and to look upon it as a question of the permanent interests of the future generation of Andhra youths. Rajahmundry will have its field. Anantapur will have its field. The amendment does not affect the college at Rajahmundry or at Anantapur. If the hon. Minister takes away the colleges, the amendment will neither help it nor prevent it. But that is neither here nor there. I am merely putting to the House that it is not called upon by this amendment to vote for the abolition of the college at Rajahmundry or in the Ceded districts. It only seeks to vindicate the well-known principle acknowledged by university experts all over the world that we must begin by concentrating the highest research in one place. With these words I have great pleasure in commending this amendment to the acceptance of the House.”

The House then adjourned for lunch.

After lunch (2-30 p.m.).

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—“Mr. President, considerable speeches have been made on this subject, viz., whether there should be one centre or more than one centre. Of course the respective merits of the places have been discussed and I do not wish to go into them again. So far as this matter (viz., whether we should have one centre or more than one centre) is concerned, in the year 1921 a committee was set up by this House as a result of a resolution passed by them. That committee recommended a unitary type of university and no colleges anywhere else. That was the type recommended by that committee in 1921. Then controversy arose both in the press and on the platform about the views expressed by that committee and Government had to appoint a special officer to go into the whole question and see whether the needs of the Telugu districts would be satisfied by one centre or by more than one centre. Mr. Statham went into the subject most carefully and made various enquiries and came to the conclusion thus: ‘The ideal proposal for the Telugu country would appear to have only two points: the concentration, one at



28th January 1929]

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

Rajahmundry and the other at Anantapur. These two will ultimately develop into one University which would suffice the needs of the Andhra desa.' He also recommended for Vizagapatam technological subjects. Now this view was taken into consideration when the Bill was considered and the Act was passed in 1925. My hon. Friend the Member for the University was speaking of expert opinion and also of the opinion of special experts in the matter. I candidly admit that I have no such experience. He stated that expert opinion in this matter was that there should be only one centre for concentration. So far as my knowledge on this subject goes several witnesses who are educationists with wide experience were examined before the Select Committee and a majority of them proposed more than one centre. In this connexion we have to see the vast area and the population which this University has to cater for. The area is 183 square miles and the population is 17 millions. The question is whether for this vast area and population one centre would be sufficient or more than one centre would be required. The decision of this House before was that we should have more than one centre. Now to shut us out only with one centre is not a position which those who were responsible for the Act should take. One or two members who spoke on this motion who were also hon. Members at that time thought that more than one centre was necessary. Now they say that there should not be more than one. Now what I ask is 'have we any experience'? I say let it be given a fair trial. As soon as the Vice-Chancellor was appointed perhaps the people thought that there should be a change in the constitution of the Act, that the whole thing should be scrapped and that there should be only one centre. As to affiliation perhaps the hon. Minister in charge has not made up his mind. The communiqué says that the whole of the remaining first-grade colleges and other colleges would be affiliated to the Madras University. In the speech that he has made he has not referred to it at all, probably he has given up that idea. My submission is that we are not asking for any new thing in asking for more than one centre. It is a thing that has emanated when several speeches were made by Government Members and even by His Excellency. His Excellency when inaugurating the Andhra University stated that there should be two centres for concentration, one at Rajahmundry and one at Anantapur and when these were developed they would become unitary types of University. That is the idea given expression to by His Excellency. The Chief Minister was promising Bezawada people that he would get monies for the Senate Hall and other buildings and also he was promising Anantapur people 7½ lakhs for the development of Honours courses in science. Of course recently too he was for more than one centre. I do not know what had happened since then. One great thing that had happened is, as the House is well aware, the death of the Raja Sahib of Panagal. I do not know how the issuing of this new communiqué had anything to do with the death of the Raja of Panagal. My suspicion is that the idea of concentrating at Vizagapatam had emanated from Sir A. P. Patro. It was not accepted by the House when the Act was passed and he had to yield to the pressure of the House then. Now, that the Chief Minister should revive the old thing and say that concentration of everything should be at Vizagapatam seems to me to be quite unreasonable. I am not saying anything against the Vice-Chancellor who has all along been advocating one centre and one centre alone. Now the idea is not, as some hon. Members seem to think, that there should be distribution of funds. We agree that so far as funds are available, in the first

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

[28th January 1929]

instance they should be devoted for the development of that centre which the House thinks should first be developed. All that we say is 'keep the Act as it is, do not disturb the Act, work the Act for what it is worth for some time and see what difficulties there are'. If the reply is that there are too many difficulties in the way of having more than one centre, then I submit it is presuming too much. It does not lie with those who were responsible for the passing of this Act now to say that the fixing of two centres was not proper and that the fixing of a neutral headquarters was worse. It is not for them to say that because they consented to the passing of the Act in that way then. If the Chief Minister's proposals are carried it means that we are going against the old Act. The Act is something like an orphan, because the father was Raja of Panagal, and the mother is Sir A. P. Patro. The mother is willing to throttle her own child's throat. . . ."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Let my hon. Friend remain neutral on the crucial amendment"

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"What I submit to the hon. Members of this House is this : we are not asking for anything new ; we are asking for the old thing only to continue. The Chief Minister has given up his own case because his position now is that he wants only one centre and his reason is that technical and technological studies should be developed in one place. Now what we submit is 'please protect the old Act.' This request ought to have come from the members lower down there. Unfortunately we have to defend the Act that was framed and passed by them for which they have the glory. We have to see whether they have the support of the House or whether the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Venkatapati Raju is supported. The only thing that has been very prominently put before you is 'we will not have enough of funds to develop more than one centre.' By all means develop one centre. But what we say is there will be Ministers in future who will find monies for the development of more than one centre. My hon. Friend, the Chief Minister, should not think that he is the only Minister who can spare money for the development of a particular centre which he has in view. If we can develop other centres in future, I ask why such an opportunity should be shut out to us."

Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—"Why not bring new Bills ?"

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"What I submit is by all means develop one centre. But let there be scope for developing more than one centre in future at least if funds are available. In these circumstances I support the motion for more than one centre and I ask the House to consider it carefully. Of course it is a very good thing to speak of ideals, of logic and all those things. I submit life is not logic. All ideal things differ from practical things. It has been stated 'why do you care for the electorate.' We are not nominated or co-opted members ; we have to represent the electorate and any one who is free to vote irrespective of the desires of the electorate has no business here. I plead guilty to the charge of desiring to represent the electorate and their wishes. I am here for that purpose and for no other."

\* Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—"Sir, after the two years' wrangling over the question of one centre and the venue of the headquarters, I think it is high time that we made the Andhra University a settled fact. Expert educational opinion is clear that for the whole Andhra province there should be only one centre concentrating on Honours and post-graduate courses.



28th January 1929] [Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan]

This ideal appeals to any one who wishes to advance the cause of education in the Andhra desa. But considering the vastness of the area and considering the fact that the Andhras have been endeavouring to have a province of their own and considering also the fact that the Circars and the Ceded districts have some differences between themselves with regard to this matter, it seems desirable that we should not shut the door against the development of another university in another part of Andhra desa. If we concentrate all post-graduate courses in one place it would be shutting the door against developing another university in another place. Therefore keeping in view the question of the concentration at one centre and developing it with the resources available at present we should continue another centre also so that another university may be established there in the future. Those who spoke in favour of one centre and one only have had Vizagapatam at the back of their minds. For with one centre only, they should have to concentrate the humanities, the sciences and technology there. But by keeping the technological studies at Vizagapatam and developing the arts and sciences at Anantapur, we would be satisfying the requirements of the Andhra desa very well. This is the wish of the people concerned and this has been expressed by the Senate of the Andhra University. The Council should give due weight to the opinion expressed by them. Although the ideal should be kept in view, necessity takes us in the direction of concentrating technology at Vizagapatam, the most suitable place for that subject and developing arts and sciences at Anantapur, another part of Andhra desa. This course will be acceptable to all schools of opinion in Andhra desa and we will be solving a problem which has been agitating the country for a long time."

\* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—" Sir, speaking on the question of concentration of Honours and post-graduate courses in one place several speakers touched on the relative merits of the various places. But let me confine my attention to the important question whether the Andhra desa with its slender financial resources can afford to dissipate its resources in more than one place. It has been said that for the vast area of the Andhra desa there should be more than one centre. But if the vastness of the area is the only consideration, even a dozen centres are not sufficient to satisfy the claims of all. From the financial point of view very few of us realize what the cost per pupil will be for this kind of higher education. Leaving alone America and Europe which spend crores of rupees on university education, in our own country Universities at Decca, Calcutta, Allahabad and Lucknow spend more than 10 lakhs of rupees per annum. The University of Benares which has spent 70 lakhs of rupees on buildings and equipment finds them inadequate and though it is spending more than 10 lakhs of rupees per annum, it is not at all able to develop many branches of learning. When such is the case, are we in Andhra desa with one or two lakhs of rupees per annum in a better position to develop all our branches of learning and that in many places? Is it not much better for us to develop only one centre at any rate to begin with—it does not matter where that place is—and develop there all the branches? Why should we dissipate our slender financial resources? My friend Mr. Swami says, 'You can at least allow the paper centres to remain there. If the Minister has a fad to develop one centre, let him develop that centre.'

"I ask, what is the good of paper centres? If later on the Andhra desa feels that there is necessity for more than one centre and that there are sufficient resources for more than one centre, we can amend the Act suitably.

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[28th January 1929]

If a philanthropist comes forward with munificent help to the university we can encourage him ; even then I would not be a party to make him dissipate his resources in all places indiscriminately. To have most if not all the youths of the Andhra desa educated in one place will confer very great benefits compared to the little inconvenience of travelling from one place to another. After all, from that point of view even if there are three centres, it would benefit only the people living in those towns and the rest will anyhow have to leave their homes and travel. Whether the centre is in the Ceded districts or in the Circars, a number of people will have to leave their own homes. Why then should we not be satisfied with one place? Let us get rid of the idea that every one of us can have the university in our own backyards and even if we can, it is not worthwhile. It is said that we could develop Honours in History at Anantapur, Honours in Science at Rajahmundry and Honours in some other subjects in some other place and so on. People who hold that view do not realize the benefit derived by concentrating the study of various branches of knowledge at one and the same place. Mutual consultation and combined working among the various professors and students at one and the same place will yield far more satisfactory results than spreading them all in different places and thus dissipating our resources. Considering all these matters,—I am not speaking on which particular place it should be, I have my own reasons to insist on certain places—whether ultimately the place chosen be ours or not, I hope the House will realize the utter impossibility and undesirability of trying to develop more than one place with the very slender financial resources. It is much better to have one efficient and good university rather than many good-for-nothing universities.”

Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, I am glad that wisdom has at last dawned on the hon. Member for East Godavari and friends who think like him. After all this trouble and turmoil, passion and conflicts for the last two years, with twelve measures in order to kill the tender plant of the university, they have now come to the conclusion that they should try to help the healthy growth of the university. I wish that this wisdom had dawned earlier and all these twelve Bills intended to destroy the Act had not been brought forward or were withdrawn with great profit to the country and great credit to themselves. I think, Sir, that those who are aware of the condition of things that existed immediately after the passing of the Andhra University Act will not have any high opinion of our patriotism in the Andhra desa and of our practical businesslike mentality. In a matter like this, whether this place should be the centre or the other place should be the headquarters we are not able to come to an agreement for the last two years. We were fighting with one another ; even now no agreement is in sight. There is no use of blaming the Government that they have not taken a lead in the matter. It will be impossible for any Government to reconcile all the conflicting views and fix a centre in one place or place the headquarters in that place. If the Government have recently stated that there should be only one centre, it seems to be in accordance with the wisdom and advice of the majority of the members of the Select Committee who considered the various Bills. The principle underlying the decision of the Select Committee was that there should be one centre. They fixed Anantapur for that. Select Committee proposed that Anantapur should be the headquarters and the only centre for proper development of the university for Andhra desa.



28th January 1929]

[Sir A. P. Patro]

"If we accept that that was the prevailing idea, that was the controlling idea of the majority of those people who subscribed that Anantapur should be the centre and headquarters, I cannot see how you can resist the reasonable conclusion drawn by the hon. the Minister for Education that there shall be one centre. The hon. Member for East Godavari admitted that, in the conflict between the various places, it will not be possible to develop many centres uniformly; nor is it possible to provide for uniform healthy growth and development of all the centres. I wish he had made this admission some time before, so that the House might have come to a better understanding of the situation earlier. Having made that admission, it is not at all reasonable to say that one centre should not be developed.

"I am not one of those who accept unreservedly that the best form of university development is the unitary type. Some reformers hold strongly the view that unitary type is the best type of university we may have. I do not agree that it is the only form that suits all the conditions of the country. Establishment of a unitary type of university may be good for England and other countries. I do not think that this type would be suitable for every part of our country. We have to take into consideration the educational as well as the economic and social conditions of our country. The Andhra desa is a vast country covering a vast area with many districts. We must give them opportunities to develop, afford them facilities for such development. To lay down as an absolute rule that the unitary type is the only type that is suitable to the condition of this country is too large a proposition, and I am sure such a proposition will not be accepted by the House. There are conditions varying in different provinces, the cultural conditions and standards also vary to have one unitary type of university. The proposal of the Government is in accordance with the principle of the hon. Member from East Godavari. When we consider the question as to which place can be immediately developed, there may be difference of opinion. Bellary wants to get away from the Andhra University scheme, as it is now. An amendment has been given notice of by the hon. Member representing Chittoor that Chittoor also should be out of the scheme of the Andhra University. Some other districts also may feel that they may be spared from the Andhra University scheme. The question is whether it is wise to bring them all under the scheme.

"We have to consider another point also. The Government say that they cannot afford to give funds to develop so many centres. I do not agree with the view of the Government. The Government ought to be able to find the funds necessary for Educational development. The development may be slow and gradual; we do not expect that the university should be established in perfect form at once. Universities have grown from humble beginnings to very high standards. Similarly it is not possible to have a good university for the Andhra desa all at once, for our resources are small and our financial conditions are slender. While I do not agree with the view that it will not be possible for the Government to find funds to develop all centres so as to make uniform progress, one centre can at least be developed more profitably.

"The hon. Member for East Godavari said that the father of the Act was one and that the mother was another. I was not responsible for having Bezwada as the headquarters though from a constitutional point of view I am responsible. It was the opinion, the prevailing opinion of the House to choose Bezwada."

[Sir A. P. Patro]

[28th January 1929]

"Having said so much with regard to the reason for my voting, I would submit that Vizagapatam should be chosen as the centre. At the time when several parts of the Andhra desa were carrying on propaganda work in connexion with the Andhra University Bill it was stated that I was partial to Vizagapatam because Vizagapatam was nearer to my place. The present Minister for Education is not living anywhere near Vizagapatam. We must take into consideration the facilities available at each centre for the growth and development of education and culture. Several facts have been placed before you to prove that Vizagapatam will be the best place, under the circumstances, where the Andhra University plant can grow in healthy surroundings. Vizagapatam has a better climate and a great railway centre. The Bengal-Nagpur Railway Company proposes to open a large factory there. We want our young men to be apprentices in such factories. The need of the day is industrial education, industrial training and industrial development. What is the place best suited for this in the Telugu districts? Vizagapatam fulfils all the conditions. In the course of the discussion of the Coastal Traffic Bill it has come out very clearly that we must have progressive development in marine engineering and seamanship and that our young men should be trained for the sea. Vizagapatam is developing a big harbour. It will be one of the best, or the best harbour in the East Coast. There will be facilities for training young men. We do not want now B.A.'s and M.A.'s. We want persons who will tuck up their sleeves and work in a factory. We want to develop such a character. We want to develop that type of education. We want persons who would make themselves useful and serviceable. Therefore you must choose the centre which will afford all such facilities. Vizagapatam possesses these and the hon. the Minister is not a day too late when he proposes that Vizagapatam should be selected as the centre where the three-centre scheme fails. That is the reason why I say, in view of the admission made by the hon. Member for East Godavari and others who think alike with him, that a change is necessary."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Mr. President, Sir, having listened to the speeches made by the two speakers preceding me in favour of Vizagapatam, Mr. Swami Nayudu and Sir Patro, there is nothing to be said on the subject. It is a very noble admission that my hon. Friend Mr. Swami Nayudu made, that practical necessities dictate the policy of the Government developing only one centre, that there can be no such thing as simultaneous development of three or four centres, that one centre will have to be developed first and that, after it is completely developed, other centres must be developed. Yet he said that the Act should be worked for what it is worth. How he can reconcile those two statements I am unable to understand. If the best centre is one that is suited to be developed at the headquarters and if, under the present Act, no centre can be situated at the headquarters, it follows that some amendment of the Act is necessary if the University is to function at all as intended by the Act. That is a thing which I am not able to understand. Some of my friends from Rajahmundry told us that the Act should be worked for what it was worth. I am not able to understand that psychology. The best centre to be developed is the headquarters and if the Act should be worked as it exactly is at this moment, there will be no centre at the University headquarters and it logically follows that nothing can be developed at the present moment. Another curious psychology is that those who talk loudest about the unworkability of diarchy are the people who presume that the Acts of the Legislature established under diarchy should be



28th January 1929] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

treated as perfect. My hon. Friend Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan was ready for a University under a bicentric system with Technology at Vizagapatam and General Arts at Anantapur. But even he has to vote for this amendment first before he can get his idea realized under the Bill of my hon. Friend, Mr. Kesava Pillai.

"It is no doubt an important question as to where the headquarters should be situated. But that will be taken up at a subsequent stage. Meanwhile, I am in very general agreement with Sir Patro who seems to have undergone some sex transformation this afternoon. My hon. Friend, Mr. Swami Nayudu, said that Sir Patro was the mother of the Act. I go further and say he is a widow since the father of the Act is no more. He himself referred to the Andhra University Act as a tender plant transforming himself as a gardener, however tender it may be or not. When my hon. Friend says that he was in no way responsible for the substitution of three centres and for deciding that Bezvada should be the headquarters, I think you will forgive him. I could not agree with him and I am still of opinion that there was grave dereliction of duty on his part. That, however, has nothing to do with the question that has come up to-day. Even my hon. Friend, Mr. Kaleswara Rao, not finding much matter to speak on the subject evidently went into the history of the mental and other changes of the hon. the Chief Minister during the last two and a half years. That may not be very illuminating. But the faults of the hon. Minister should not be visited on the Andhra University. It is common ground—it is a ground which nobody has yet contested—that the Act, as it is now, renders the organization of the teaching side of the Andhra University absolutely impossible, and yet my hon. Friends from the Andhra desa had always been pleading for no replica of the Madras University, not for an affiliating University but a new model one, devoted to the development of the technological side. They wanted that it ought to be a teaching university and when they are asked to fulfil the conditions of working for the realization of their own ambition, they turn round and say we must represent our particular locality. Those who are here elected by Rajahmundry are responsible for Rajahmundry. Rajahmundry is part of Andhra desa and I hope my hon. Friend would take courage as a nationalist and as a swarajist and say that Rajahmundry is part of Andhra desa. It is Andhra desa that is getting represented in a particular way through Rajahmundry. The fight should not be Andhra desa for Rajahmundry, but Rajahmundry for Andhra desa and it is then only that we can win our battle.

3-15  
p.m.

"We ought to approach the thing in the proper manner, namely, from the point of view of what type of university the Andhras desire: is it to be a teaching university or a mere affiliating university. There can be only one. Let me say this in favour of my hon. Friend Sir Patro. He did fight for concentration, but when he found difficulties he did not give it up altogether, but gave it some kind of recognition in the Act. Again, my hon. Friend, Sir Patro, introduced clauses for the organization of Publication department, for the organization of the University staff and for the carrying on of extension work there; and so many other things were possible only by a teaching university which will have the largest possible concentration in one place. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, which, of course, were not realized

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[28th January 1929]

in the Act, much was said about nation-building activities of the university and how by concentrating the Andhra youth, with the best professors, possible to get only under the University recruitment, we would be doing the greatest service for the cultural, political and social progress of the country. Unfortunately this object did not get efficient implementation in the Act, which we are trying to rectify. The Opposition are not responsible—I repudiate the theory of my hon. Friend Mr. K. V. R. Swami that everybody in the House was responsible, for Ministerial acts. Primarily the honour goes to my Friend Sir Patro. I am not sure that he will disown the honour. Let us consider it from the point of view of the teaching university. Could we remain at Bezwada and develop the centre when Bezwada is not the centre and could we get the best results by taking over colleges in different places and developing one faculty here and another faculty there? But we Andhras are nationalists. Moreover, the scope of this amendment is nothing very serious. It does not affect the Intermediate colleges, you can have as many of them as you can; it does not affect the pass courses. The whole of this controversy is about the honours and post-graduate courses. With reference to that, my hon. Friend from Rajahmundry has said that the Academic Council is the highest authority on all educational matters. I submit that not even under the new Act the Academic Council is the supreme body, and for a wonder the Government have accepted that proposition. They are willing to help us to have a nation-building university. It is really strange that we Andhra nationalists are sparing the gift which the bureaucratic or semi-bureaucratic Government has given. I will ask my Friends to think twice before voting. It affects only the honours and post-graduate studies. My hon. Friend Mr. Swami thinks that only 150 students could be taken. I am willing to make it 300, because I am more patriotic and more optimistic. Does it stand to reason to ask even in this Legislative Council for three centres, instead of trying to secure the best possible centre? Either we want a teaching university or we do not want it. If you do not want a teaching university, say to the world that you do not want it and that it does not suit your genius. If you want only the affiliating type of university, you have only to delete all the provisions for the extension work, for publication work and for the organization of teaching staff by the university. Or, if you want a teaching university on an up-to-date model which will on the one side look after its intramural work and research and creative work, and which will also carry on rural reconstruction work of all kinds in its extramural aspect on the other side, vote for this proposition and rectify the error. In the light of administrative experience also, the proposition may be accepted.

“One word more and I have done. I do not agree with my hon. Friend Sir Patro in regard to the unitary university with affiliating functions. I don't think I can personally endorse that view and I don't think that that policy would be consistent. I don't object to the university being located at Anantapur or Vizagapatam or Rajahmundry or even in Timbuktoo if we can include it in Andhra desa. Nothing is more distressing than this psychology: communities saying, if this kind of safeguard is given, we don't want *swaraj*; localities saying if our interests are not properly conserved in this arrangement, we do not want it. We should never subordinate the higher to the lower. It is in your own interests. After all, this university has been in existence only for the last two and a half years. What is it you gain by cutting yourselves off from your own people? Is Madras going to



28th January 1929] [Mr C. Ramalinga Reddi]

be more sympathetic towards us than the Northern Circars? I think, you seem to be thinking about it more in passion than in a right and calm atmosphere. I heartily commend this proposition to the unanimous acceptance of the House."

Mr. R. NAGAN GOWDA :—" I move that the question be now put."

The motion was put and carried.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that in clause 2 of Mr. Venkatapati Raju's Bill for the words 'in the town of Anantapur' the words 'in the headquarters of the university' be substituted."

The amendment was put and declared carried.

Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao demanded a poll and the House divided thus :—

*Ayes :*

- |                                                     |                                                  |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.                | 39. Mr. H. F. P. Hearson.                        |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 40. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja.                   |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.                                | 41. Mr. S. Arpudawami Udayar.                    |
| 4. " Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.               | 42. The Zamindar of Kallikota.                   |
| 5. " Mr. M. R. Setaratnam Ayyar.                    | 43. Mr. U. Ramaswami Ayyar.                      |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.                      | 44. Swami A. S. Sabajanandam.                    |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan.                             | 45. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao.                           |
| 8. Mr. Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar.                   | 46. " Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.                 |
| 9. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Bazul-lah Sahib Bahadur.   | 47. " S. Satyamarti.                             |
| 10. Mr. H. A. Watson.                               | 48. " P. Anjaneyulu.                             |
| 11. " C. A. Souter.                                 | 49. " P. C. Venkatapati Raju.                    |
| 12. " S. H. Slater.                                 | 50. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur.              |
| 13. " A. McG. C. Tampoe.                            | 51. K. Uppi Sahib Bahadur.                       |
| 14. " C. W. E. Cotton.                              | 52. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.               |
| 15. " V. Ch. John.                                  | 53. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.                   |
| 16. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.                    | 54. " K. Koti Reddi.                             |
| 17. Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur.                     | 55. " L. K. Tulasingam.                          |
| 18. Abdul Wahab Sahib Bahadur.                      | 56. " C. Marudavanam Pillai.                     |
| 19. Mr. H. B. Ari Gowder.                           | 57. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.                |
| 20. " A. B. Shetty.                                 | 58. " K. Madhavan Nayar.                         |
| 21. " J. A. Davis.                                  | 59. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.                   |
| 22. " R. Foulkes.                                   | 60. " Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai.             |
| 23. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pill i.                      | 61. " K. P. Raman Menon.                         |
| 24. Mahmud Schammad Sahib Bahadur.                  | 62. " C. Gopala Menon.                           |
| 25. Mr. Muppil Nayar.                               | 63. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapathi Mudaliyar. |
| 26. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.           | 64. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.                 |
| 27. Mr. K. Krishnan.                                | 65. Mr. K. R. Karant.                            |
| 28. " N. Siva Raj.                                  | 66. " P. T. Rajan.                               |
| 29. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.                      | 67. " T. K. Chidamburanatha Mudaliyar.           |
| 30. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.                     | 68. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.            |
| 31. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar.                | 69. Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur.                  |
| 32. " S. Subrahmanya Moopanar.                      | 70. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.     |
| 33. " Daniel Thomas.                                | 71. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.             |
| 34. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.                        | 72. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa Chettiyar.  |
| 35. Mr. C. R. Reddi.                                | 73. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.                  |
| 36. " W. E. Smith.                                  | 74. The Kumararaja of Venkatagiri.               |
| 37. " C. E. Wood.                                   | 75. Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao.                       |
| 38. " F. E. James.                                  |                                                  |

[28th January 1929]

*Noes.*

- |                                    |                                    |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. | 13. Mr. A. Parasurama Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Mr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva.      | 14. „ C. Ramasomayajulu.           |
| 3. „ S. Venkiah.                   | 15. „ P. Bhaktavatsalu Nayudu.     |
| 4. Rao Sahib M. Hampayya.          | 16. „ A. Kaleswara Rao.            |
| 5. Mr. K. Abdul Hye Sahib.         | 17. „ B. Venkataratnam.            |
| 6. „ C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.  | 18. „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.     |
| 7. „ G. Harisarvottama Rao.        | 19. „ R. Nagan Gowda.              |
| 8. „ K. V. R. Swami.               | 20. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.    |
| 9. „ D. Narayana Raju.             | 21. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.  |
| 10. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.            | 22. „ P. Siva Rao.                 |
| 11. Mr. M. Narayana Rao.           | 23. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.          |
| 12. „ C. Obi Reddi.                |                                    |

Ayes 75. Noes 23.

The amendment was carried.

3-30  
p.m.

Clause 2 as amended was then put, passed and added to the Bill.

\* **MR. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU** :—“ Mr. President, Sir, now I move that the Bill be passed into law. With regard to the aspect of the concentration of this higher culture in one central place in the Andhra country, we had now a very effective and demonstrative vote of the House, and it has got the support of almost all fair-minded experts and critics and persons who deal with university matters. And so I am quite sure that it does not require any amount of persuasion from me that this Bill should be passed into law and the Andhra University should be made to work up to this higher ideal which I am glad has been accepted even at this belated stage. Had this aspect been accepted even at the beginning we would not have had the sad spectacle of the Andhra University groping in the darkness for these number of years. Unfortunately the headquarters is located at a place where there is no centre and except its being a replica of the Madras University in conducting the examinations, the Andhra University has not done any real and efficient work that it was required to do, namely, to advance the higher culture of the Andhra people and to cater to the technological needs, the present needs of the present-day people. And now by the acceptance of this vote, the question of the headquarters being located in a place where there is a centre or its being located at a neutral place has been set at rest. The activities of the Andhra University will be concentrated at its headquarters irrespective of whether there be other centres or not. And now I am glad that the House has by an overwhelming majority been pleased to accept that view and put the Andhra University in a position to achieve the object for which it was intended, and through you, Sir, I request the House to pass this Bill into law and make it an Act.”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I second it.”

\* **MR. S. SATYAMURTI** :—“ Sir, I beg to move a formal amendment and that is, to substitute the figure ‘9’ for the figure ‘7’ in clause 1. That shows incidentally the length of time we have taken over these Bills, but this is a necessary amendment which would make the chronology accurate.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—“ I second it.”

The motion was put and carried.

The motion that the Bill be passed into law was then put and carried.



28th January 1929]

BILL NO. 4 OF 1928.

- Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"It appears to me that it is a big conspiracy I am fighting against—the conspiracy between the ex-Minister and the present Minister. No doubt, the Senate of the Andhra University has decided by a majority of 35 to 60 declaring that Anantapur should be the centre of the University. The Select Committee of the Madras Legislative Council consisting of 35 members of all shades of opinion affirmed the decision of the Senate that Anantapur should be the headquarters of the University. The Andhra conferences held in November 1927 have unanimously and unequivocally given the verdict for Anantapur. And then, we find now that they have been trying to undermine our position and attempting to put in Vizagapatam in place of Anantapur. I move that the Bill be taken into consideration."

Mr. K. ABDUL HYE SAHIB:—"I second it."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO:—"Mr. President, I rise to oppose this motion. With regard to the first question that all higher culture of the University should be concentrated at the headquarters, of course, it is passed by a vote of the House and I have no quarrel with it. I have absolutely no objection. But I do not want that the Bills which propose to transfer the headquarters from Bezvada to any other place should be supported. So I want to oppose all these Bills. Therefore, Sir, I oppose the consideration of this Bill."

\* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"I am surprised, Sir, that my hon. Friend from Kistna should oppose the consideration of this Bill. Whatever he may want or may not want, this is a simple matter which has been decided by more than one body. The Senate of the Andhra University has decided in favour of Anantapur. The Select Committee of the Legislative Council has decided in favour of Anantapur. And till last evening it appeared as though we had the support of many. I am surprised at the position taken up by Mr. Kaleswara Rao, the representative for Kistna, for this reason, that he should oppose the consideration of a Bill the subject matter of which has been under consideration for such a length of time and about which so much discussion has taken place on the floor of this House and decisions have been given by responsible bodies which he and I and every one of us must respect. I do not want to take up more time at this stage. I know that this Council will decline to consider my friend's suggestion. I am quite sure that my hon. Friend from Anantapur will be allowed to bring forward his Bill for the consideration of the Council. When it has come up for such consideration it will be time enough for us to discuss as to whether the subject-matter of the Bill should be accepted or not."

• The motion that Bill No. 4 of 1928 be taken into consideration was put and carried.

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Mr. President, I move this amendment—

*'Re-number clause 1 as sub-clause (1) and in the said sub-clause for the word and figures "of 1928" substitute the figures "1929".'*

*"After the said sub-clause insert the following sub-clause:—" (2) It shall come into force on such date as the Local Government may, by notification in the Fort St. George Gazette, appoint."*

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

[28th January 1929]

“Mr. President, the first one is of course merely a verbal amendment intended to make the language correct. The second one is to give power to the Government to bring this Act into force at a time when it is suitable to do so.”

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—“I second it.”

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 1 as amended was then put, passed and added to the Bill.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Now, clause 2 will be taken up for consideration. Various Members have given notice of amendments for substituting other places for Anantapur. I think it will be more convenient to the House if every one of those amendments is moved and after the full debate is over, one after another is voted upon. If the first place is voted upon by a majority, amendments relating to the other places cannot be put to the vote.

“Or, the other thing I suggest is to make the Minister's amendment the substantial amendment and then ask other Members to move their own amendments, and when those are disposed of, the Minister's amendment may be disposed of. That will be another convenient arrangement, so that there may be a vote of the House on every one of these amendments.”

The House signified its agreement with the second suggestion.

#### Clause 2.

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“Mr. President, I move the following amendment :—

‘For clause 2 substitute the following clause :—

‘(2) In sub-section (2) of section 3 of the Andhra University Act, 1925, for the word “Bezawada” the word “Vizagapatam” shall be substituted.’

“Mr. President, I have already given reasons why I think Vizagapatam should be substituted as the headquarters of the University. Now, having carried the principle of concentration in one centre, it would not be proper if we retain the headquarters at Bezawada itself which is not a centre at all. So we have got to find a place which will answer the purpose of being a centre for real development of the Andhra University. After having considered this question for over 2½ years and, as my Friend Mr. Kaleswara Rao put it, after having vacillated between place and place not knowing exactly how this question stood in various places, I have come to the conclusion now that Vizagapatam would be the best place for concentration.

“I think that some of the reasons for this I have already given when supporting the principle of only one centre being developed, and I do not want to reiterate any of the reasons I gave then, except to point out that Vizagapatam is climatically better than most of the places in the Andhra desa for the location of a university. It is a place which is of growing importance, because with the coming in of the harbour and the new railway



28th January 1929]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

to Jeypore and the bringing of the workshop of the Bengal-Nagpur Railway to Waltair, it will be of great importance in the industrial sense; and as hon. Members opposite are never tired of pointing out that any new University that is being developed should have a technological bias, they, I am sure, will admit that such a bias can easily be given at a place like Vizagapatam rather than at Rajahmundry or Anantapur—because these are the other two places which we have to consider after carrying the Bill of Mr. Venkatapati Raju. Rajahmundry has no doubt got a history of its own, especially in an academic sense, because it had got the only Government college in the Andhra desa till the Ceded Districts College at Anantapur was founded. But Rajahmundry has not got the same facilities that Vizagapatam has for the purpose of technological study. Taking Anantapur, it has had only a first-grade college during the last seven years, and still I may say it is in the stage of development; and if really the Vice-Chancellor of the Andhra University is to have an eye over all the institutions concentrated in the headquarters, it will be better for him to be in a place where both technology and arts and sciences could be developed rather than in a place like Anantapur where if any development could take place at all it could be only in arts and sciences. And I have stated this is not the type of university that members opposite and members behind me want. It is that which has impelled me to propose Vizagapatam as headquarters of the university. As I stated, I have passed from stage to stage but only two places I considered all the time; they are Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam. Rajahmundry I thought of first for the simple reason that the university of the type they wanted was only like the ordinary unitary teaching university where arts and sciences could be developed. But as hon. Members are so keen on trying a university with a technological bias, there is no doubt whatever that if that is the thing that is exercising the minds of the members of the Council, the only alternative is Vizagapatam, and that is the reason why I am proposing that Vizagapatam should be substituted for Bezwada."

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—"I second it."

\* Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—"The procedure is not quite clear to me. I have given notice of an amendment for substituting Rajahmundry for Anantapur."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I am now giving an opportunity to members who have given notice of amendments that they may move them in the form 'for the word "Vizagapatam" substitute the word (the place given in the amendment)'. You may move it in that form."

\* Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—"If that is so, I shall proceed, Sir. I move that—

"For the word "Viazgapatam" the word "Rajahmundry" be substituted."

"We are in a peculiar state, a very unhappy state. The Chief Minister has made a frank statement to-day that he has undergone a series of courses of vacillation during the last so many months and he is ultimately safe in the harbour at Vizagapatam. I do not know whether after all, that is going to be his last place of resort. It has been pointed out when discussing the other motions, that most of these fluctuations and indecision in the matter of this Andhra University are due not to the attitude the Government has been taking from time to time. But it has been laid at the doors of the

[Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu] [28th January 1929]

Andhras that this vacillation denotes an absence of purpose, an absence of unity among the Andhras. We repudiate that charge. We are not responsible, it is the Government that is absolutely responsible; it is the Government that is not able to make up its mind. In 1927, he (the Chief Minister) was promising to provide an additional centre at Bezawada which was then the headquarters. Subsequently he supported Rajahmundry and now he supports Vizagapatam. He has travelled through the whole of the Andhra desa and he has taken us also through the whole Andhra desa. Therefore it is the vacillating policy of the Government that is responsible for the indecision and not the Andhra members themselves. With that prelude I wish to support my amendment by a reference to historical antecedents.

"Hon. Members of the House are aware that so far as Rajahmundry was concerned, it was passed by the Select Committee on the Andhra University Act which is now the ruling Act as the place for headquarters and it was almost universally accepted. We do not know the reasons that brought about the unfortunate decision by which a place which was not worthy of being considered even a university centre has been chosen as headquarters. To-day we have seen member after member decrying that fatalistic decision. For the information of the House I may say that members of the Select Committee came to the conclusion that Rajahmundry must be the headquarters of the Andhra University and it was naturally expected that Rajahmundry would be decided on by the Council. But unfortunately—and it was a matter of accident—that was not chosen. Subsequently, Bezawada was chosen and a controversy had arisen over it. Matters were allowed to take their own course, until one fine morning it was decided by the Senate that the headquarters must also be the centre. Then it was proposed in the Senate that the centre at Rajahmundry should be removed and should be located at Bezawada. For the satisfaction of those members who have considered this controversy as an unseemly exhibition of parochial patriotism in regard to the respective claims of Bezawada and Rajahmundry, I may say that unless and until the attempt was made to take away the centre from the ancient place of Rajahmundry, we did not think of making any move at all. When once the attempt was made to remove the centre from Rajahmundry and locate it at some other place, then we did take the initiative. I brought forward a Bill that the headquarters might be shifted to a place which is an age-old cultural centre, worthy of being developed into headquarters station, with post-graduate studies and honours courses. It was in those circumstances that we moved for the removal of the headquarters. Now that the Bill of Mr. Venkatapati Raju is passed, the necessity is all the greater; the responsibility of each individual member is all the greater. In deciding the location of the headquarters the House has to select a place which is a most desirable one economically, historically and otherwise. Rajahmundry satisfies all the requirements. I say economically because the place which was already fully equipped with laboratories and library and has already advanced to such an extent that to make it the headquarters and then institute post-graduate studies no additional amount need be spent, has got to be selected and no other place can have all these advantages. I should like to ask the Council to remove from their mind the fact that I am speaking for Rajahmundry, because I happen to be an inhabitant of the Godavari district. I request the hon. members to take a dispassionate view of the whole matter. Here we are going for the first time to embark in actual practice upon an enterprise although the enterprise has been there in statute for more than two years.



28th January 1929] [Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu]

Now we are going to institute a post-graduate course, honours course and research work courses, and then the question is which is the proper place for all these things. That is one important consideration, whether economically or academically. We have got the opinion of Professor Radhakrishnan that Rajahmundry has been developed to such an extent that it was worthy of being developed into a university centre, more than a decade ago. He made that announcement at Bezwada. So that, when we have got to hand a place which was capable of being developed as a university centre more than a decade ago, I do not think any person would hesitate in the matter of the choice unless it be that other considerations would prevail. My answer is that no other considerations ought to prevail except the one of academic usefulness. Therefore my point is that the strongest case is made out for Rajahmundry. Apart from all these things, there is the fact that Rajahmundry was actually accepted as headquarters at one time in the history of this legislation. But somehow or other, it was not to be. I am only pointing out that the Government has not devoted that attention to the matter which it ought to have. All those reasons given by the Chief Minister in the communiqué had been in existence even at the time when the Chief Minister gave an amendment in favour of Rajahmundry. Even to-day he has made an announcement that Rajahmundry is no doubt the best place which ought to have been thought of, but so far as technological education is concerned facilities for it at Rajahmundry are not so preponderating as those at Vizagapatam. My point is this. Facility for technological studies by itself cannot outweigh the advantages which Rajahmundry possesses academically and otherwise and which Vizagapatam cannot claim. All those conditions that the Chief Minister pointed out had been in existence when he gave an amendment in support of Rajahmundry. I fail to see what happened since to change his mind, and he has not convinced the House with any particular reasons for this change of front. I fail to see any in his speeches on both the occasions to-day. Even 4 p.m. under the existing Act there is provision for development of Vizagapatam as a technological centre. Even under the present Bill which has now been passed there is absolutely nothing to prevent the Government from taking such steps as are necessary for the advancement of technological education in Vizagapatam. With regard to Rajahmundry I would point out that you have got a teachers' college and an arts college nearly half a century old. There they are preparing students for advanced courses of study. And you have got Dr. Radhakrishnan's testimony to the effect that it was fit to be developed into a university centre more than a decade ago. It has got a history behind it. From the very early days it was a place of educational and cultural activities. Besides all these things I would point out that it is absolutely necessary that the headquarters of the university must be in a place where a liberal atmosphere prevails. You cannot find a better place than Rajahmundry in all these respects. It is a place where the free thought movement originated. Female education has advanced there more than in any other place. It occupies the first place among cities in the matter of advanced culture either in social, political or academic fields.

"Sir, the Chief Minister seems to think that he has made a strong point when he said that Vizagapatam possesses a more salubrious climate. May I point out to the House that in the Select Committee it was brought to light that within 4 miles of Rajahmundry there is a tuberculosis sanatorium upon

[Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu]

[28th January 1929]

a bill in the same place where it was proposed to locate the university headquarters? The sanatorium on the Sapper's Hill has been said to be working with success on account of its excellent climate. I do not want to recount the long history of the qualifications of Rajahmundry and tire the House. I request you to forget the personal element in the matter and take an impartial view not minding which viewpoint the Government supports. I would request you to consider the requisites necessary for locating the headquarters of a university and, if you find that Rajahmundry satisfies all the conditions necessary in a manner which the other places are not likely to satisfy, you had better vote for Rajahmundry. I am extremely sorry that speaker after speaker went on saying that members are swayed by provincial patriotism. Even the Vice-Chancellor remarked like that. I say that even though we are nationalists, as members of the Andhra desa, we are entitled to urge the claims of our districts. I do not belong to Rajahmundry at all. I belong to East Godavari. So it cannot be said that I am urging the claims of Rajahmundry simply out of love for my district. Economically speaking also, you need not spend so much money as in other places. Academically speaking it satisfies all requirements more than any other place and for climatic reasons also Rajahmundry should be selected as the Sapper's Hill possesses a salubrious climate. Please leave out personal equations in the matter and come to a final decision at least now and save us from the obloquy of being considered as persons who are merely actuated by provincial or local patriotism."

Mr. C. N. MUTHURANGA MUDALIYAR :—"I second it."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The motion before the House is to substitute 'Rajahmundry' for 'Vizagapatam'."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—"On a point of order, Sir. You have allowed Mr. Kesava Pillai to move 'Anantapur' for 'Bezwaada'."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Mr. Kesava Pillai's Bill is for consideration."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—"Yes. So, Anantapur will not come again for discussion."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"There is no point of order at all."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—"I want to know what the position is. Two amendments have been moved, one for Anantapur and . . ."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"To make the matter clear so that there may not be further complication about the issues, I may say that the clause in Mr. Kesava Pillai's Bill is for consideration now. That clause says: *For 'Bezwaada' substitute 'Anantapur'*. For that clause the hon. the Chief Minister has moved an amendment to substitute 'Vizagapatam' for 'Anantapur'. In order to give an opportunity to hon. Members to discuss their amendments, it has been agreed that the hon. the Chief Minister's amendment might first be made a substantive motion and the other amendments moved as amendments to that motion. After full discussion of these amendments, every one of them would be put to the vote of the House and then the amendment or motion of the hon. the Chief Minister would be put to the vote of the House. There is unanimity of opinion in favour of this procedure being adopted.



28th January 1929]

[The President]

"As the other amendments to clause 2 are not moved, the amendment of Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu is now for the discussion of the House."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"Mr. President, Sir, the unfortunate lot . . ."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think it will be more for the convenience of the House at this stage only to examine the relative merits of Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam. Much of the time of the House will be saved if hon. Members confine their remarks to the relative merits of Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU:—"Mr. President, Sir, if only the choice lies between Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam, I for one would prefer Rajahmundry to Vizagapatam for the following reasons. The question of Vizagapatam, its salubrious climate and all the rest of it was discussed threadbare in the old Council and in the Select Committee of this Council. Vizagapatam was thought best fitted for starting technological and technical institutions alone. It does not claim more than a second-grade college now. Rajahmundry, although in my opinion other places are equally good, has got the academic atmosphere whatever that may mean. Rajahmundry with all the historical associations coupled with its name has certainly a better claim. It has got a training college and a number of other advantages. At one time even the hon. the Minister for Education was waxing eloquent over the superior claims of Rajahmundry and of Sapper's Hill for the location of the headquarters. I would urge in addition to all the arguments advanced by my hon. Friend from East Godavari only one word more. In this matter, though I was for other centres and though I do not belong to Rajahmundry or its vicinity, I must say this: that there are one or two considerations to be borne in mind in deciding this question. There are two aspects of the question to be chiefly considered in this matter. The viewpoint of the parents and guardians and secondly the demand from the locality for post-graduate and research studies. Rajahmundry satisfies these conditions. It is more central than Vizagapatam. Vizagapatam is practically far away from the coastal districts and unless something is done by the municipality it will not be free from malaria. Rajahmundry is more accessible to the Nizam's dominions, the coastal districts and even the Ceded districts. For all these reasons, without taking a parochial view of the matter and without any predilections for one place or another, I consider that Rajahmundry should be chosen. I would request the House to take a dispassionate view of the matter and vote for Rajahmundry."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I think the passing of the Bill of my hon. Friend by the very significant majority, 75 has altered the position very radically. I would earnestly therefore beg of my hon. Friends to view this question from a fresh point of view. The House has agreed definitely to the position that all post-graduate and honours work should be concentrated at one place in the Andhra desa. Therefore the only question is which place that should be. No longer it is a question merely of administrative headquarters of the university as it was at the time of the passing of the original Act. Now the headquarters of the university, by a previous vote of this House, has come to carry with it the very high responsibility of being the only centre for post-graduate and honours work of the Andhra University, and from that point of view and that point of view alone, I earnestly beg of

4-15  
P.M.

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[28th January 1929]

my hon. Friends to consider this question. There are, as you Mr. President indicated, only two places for consideration, viz., either Rajahmundry or Vizagapatam. I am sure I reflect the opinion of many hon. Members of this House when I say that it is not so very easy to make a choice between these two places. My heart, my up-bringing, my understanding of the academic traditions in the Andhra desa, all persuade me to vote for Rajahmundry. It has stood in our eyes for academic distinction in the Andhra desa. It contains the oldest college in the whole of the Andhra desa. It has produced many distinguished Andhra gentlemen who have distinguished themselves in various walks of public life. Moreover, Sir, it has academic traditions dating back to medieval, and if I may say so, ancient times. The famous Rajaraja Narendra is believed to have had his headquarters there, and more than that there flows one of our most sacred rivers, the Godavari, associated with one of our oldest and most sacred epics, viz., the Ramayana. It is impossible for us to give up Rajahmundry and agree to its being relegated to a secondary place in the scheme of future Andhra high class universities. My hon. Friend, the Minister for Education, tried to exalt the claims of Vizagapatam over Rajahmundry. In the whole of his speech, excepting one argument which I propose to meet presently, he has not advanced any very solid arguments as to why he should prefer Vizagapatam to Rajahmundry. He talked of technology as one of the chief aims of the activities of the University, and said that technology can be developed only at Vizagapatam. He said 'You cannot have two centres of university for research at Andhra desa and therefore Vizagapatam should be the place where you can have concentration for both arts and technological studies'. There are just one or two flaws in this sorites which I should like to point out. If I may say so, I am one of those—I know I am in a minority—who believe that this feeling that you should have no university set apart for humanities unless you have technologies also is not very sound for academic development. I know that many friends of mine feel that the time has come when this Legislative Council should vote for no funds unless a university attempts simultaneously to teach humanities and technology. Not only that, they feel that it should be an institute for technical and technological studies. I believe university development in the West has been altogether in different directions. Oxford and Cambridge are no doubt specializing in science, but it has been reserved to the modern universities of Manchester and Leeds to specialize in technology. I wonder, if we are to learn from our own mistakes, whether we are not proceeding on wrong lines when we are attempting to combine at one and the same place simultaneously both arts and technological studies. Therefore I am not clear in my mind about this point and I should like to hear from my hon. Friend the learned Vice-Chancellor whether he feels that he or his successor will be competent as the Vice-Chancellor of the University to supervise the advanced post-graduate and technological studies simultaneously. I know he is a very distinguished gentleman but I feel that even he must feel diffident of being able to ride like a Colossus over these two branches of studies, which nowhere in the world are controlled by a single university in that advanced stage we want. Assuming that technological studies must be developed in one and the same place, between the two, viz., Vizagapatam and Rajahmundry, may they not be developed in Rajahmundry? What are the insuperable obstacles in having post-graduate and technological studies in Rajahmundry



28th January 1929]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

itself? I have not heard any arguments against it. I think there is ample space near about Rajahmundry where such studies may be developed. The only special point about Vizagapatam is that it is going to have a harbour, and once it is an accomplished fact, technological studies may be better developed at Vizagapatam. Assuming the soundness of that position, I think only one branch of technological studies, viz., Harbour and Marine Engineering, can be better developed at Vizagapatam. I do not think that other branches of studies cannot be developed elsewhere.

"The other position which I want to submit to this House is—I want the House to consider it carefully—whether the future development of the Andhra University may not be better achieved if arts studies are concentrated in Rajahmundry and technological studies at Vizagapatam. The House voted just a few minutes ago in favour of the Bill of my hon. Friend from Vizagapatam. It has not stated that collegiate education should not be given outside the headquarters of the University. It merely says that all honours and post-graduate studies should be concentrated in the headquarters of the University. As far as the time I need care to provide for, I do not think that development of post-graduate and technological studies in one and the same place is necessary. Therefore I see no insuperable obstacle in the way of Rajahmundry being the headquarters of arts studies concentrating in itself all the post-graduate and honours course leaving Vizagapatam to develop on the technological side. Therefore it seems to me that Rajahmundry's claims have not been fully looked into by my hon. Friend the Minister and, unless I hear some more arguments against Rajahmundry, I propose to cast my vote in favour of Rajahmundry. In case Rajahmundry fails I propose to vote for Vizagapatam because it seems to me if we cannot vote for Rajahmundry, I should rather vote for Vizagapatam than for other places such as Bezwada or Anantapur. Bezwada was put in as the headquarters because that was an educational desert in the words of the Raja of Panagal. He used the argument that the headquarters of the University should be free from any claims of colleges in the locality. That argument being there, Bezwada cannot now be the only centre of University. If Bezwada cannot be the centre, for reasons too obvious to hon. Members, I think that Anantapur is out of the question."

(Hon. Members:—"Question.")

MR. S. SATYAMURTI:—"For geographical causes. I do not believe that hon. Members of the Northern Circars or even those lower down the districts would agree to have all post-graduate work of the Andhra University being done at Anantapur."

(Voices:—"We would prefer Anantapur.")

MR. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Misfortune makes strange bed-fellows, and that is why Bezwada friends prefer to have Anantapur. Anyway I do not want to comment further upon that point.

"Mr. President, it seems to me that my hon. Friend the Chief Minister may enlighten us, if he chooses once again to speak on this debate, about the Government communiqué on this matter. The Government communiqué has laid down an ideal with which I am generally in sympathy, viz., there should be a residential and teaching University at Vizagapatam and all the other colleges should be affiliated back again to the Madras University. That is a matter essentially for Andhra sentiment. If my Andhra friends feel

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[28th January 1929]

that Andhra culture and tradition are likely to be affected by such affiliation, I think that sentiment ought to be respected. I therefore put it to my hon. Friend the Minister for Education whether in view of the fact that the House has accepted the concentration of honours and post-graduate work in one centre, the Government cannot see their way not to insist on the other colleges reverting back to the Madras University. I am rather in sympathy with the views expressed by my hon. Friend the Vice-Chancellor that probably it will be better on the whole for the Andhra desa to function as a cultural unit, all the colleges being affiliated to the Andhra University. I admit the ideal of a teaching University. But since we are not likely to have such universities all over the Andhra desa, such places where we cannot have separate universities may have their colleges affiliated to this big Andhra University for sometime just as the Madras University is functioning. If the hon. the Minister makes the position clear that all the first and second grade colleges will be permitted to continue, and there will be no obstacles to more first-grade colleges rising in other places, we shall be able to have created by means of a vote of this House a real Andhra University where Andhra youths will get their highest education which modern science and arts could give them. With these few words, I should like to commend to this House the amendment in favour of Rajahmundry being the headquarters with all its attendant privileges, failing that, in favour of Vizagapatam provided the Government make their position clear by saying that they are not going to penalise the existing second and first grade colleges or even the few first-grade colleges that may be established in future."

\*Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—" I do not think I have any difficulty in making up my mind to vote as between Vizagapatam and Rajahmundry. When the time comes for me to speak in favour of Anantapur I shall do so. I shall therefore have my say now on the motion as between Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam. Between these two places I see no advantage in favour of Rajahmundry. There is an old dilapidated college. If Rajahmundry is to be established as the headquarters, that college should have to be rebuilt. The same could be done at Vizagapatam. So, as far as the advantage of a building is concerned, Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam stand on the same level. It has been stated that such technological courses which cannot be developed at Rajahmundry can be developed at Vizagapatam. What is the advantage then in having two places in Northern Circars for the development of technological courses? Is it not a distinct advantage to develop all the technological courses in one and the same place instead of apportioning them between two places?

" It has been said that Rajahmundry has hoary literary traditions about it, so also many other places. But we are not considering them now. We are building a new university to suit the needs of the present generation. For that Vizagapatam is as suitable in certain directions as and more suitable in others than Rajahmundry. The climate of Vizagapatam is certainly better than that of Rajahmundry. A good climate is very essential to enable the students to make full use of the laboratories and libraries even during the summer months. It is very difficult if not absolutely impossible for research students to work in Rajahmundry during summer.

" Although it is possible to develop technology in one place and arts and sciences in another, I think it would be financially if not educationally also



28th January 1929] [Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

advantageous if both of them are developed in one and the same place. There is a good deal of common ground between technological and scientific studies. Take for instance applied chemistry. The researches in chemistry will be very useful for applied chemistry. I can understand the case of Anantapur. If you have to satisfy them, as you cannot develop technology there, you can have arts and sciences alone there. But if in the Northern Circars itself you can find a place where both arts and sciences and technological studies could be developed together, why not prefer that to another place where these could not be developed? I am not one of those who maintain that it is absolutely necessary that all these should go together. But if it is possible, it is certainly much better to concentrate at one place. When it is possible to develop both the arts and sciences and the technological subjects at Vizagapatam I prefer Vizagapatam to Rajahmundry since I see no counter-advantage in favour of Rajahmundry."

\* Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—"Mr. President, I was surprised to note the hon. Member for the University blowing hot and cold over this question of concentration. He is in favour of Vizagapatam and he is also in favour of Rajahmundry. The vote of the House has shown it beyond doubt that the vast majority are in favour of concentration of honours and post-graduate courses at one place. Then, let us have concentration at Vizagapatam. The hon. Minister gave as one of his reasons for the choice a better climate and healthier surroundings; I should say that no less important is the ground of economy. With the splendid harbour growing there, it will be a valuable aid for the study of marine engineering. The same plants and laboratories used for the purpose of technological studies can be used also for the purpose of teaching certain scientific subjects. It will be economical to have one and the same kind of equipment for both. The plants, workshops, etc., can serve the teaching of science also. The hon. Member for the University spoke of certain reasons which induced him to support Rajahmundry. The hon. Member Mr. Koti Reddi spoke of the dilapidated buildings at Rajahmundry; but that only shows their antiquity and the great use to which those buildings must have been put. Both for reasons of the excellent climate and on grounds of economy I think we may vote for Vizagapatam in preference to Rajahmundry. The hon. Member for the University said that the University should not confine itself to the technological studies alone. I quite agree with him that the University should promote liberal culture and train the intellect and reasoning capacities. It must not over-emphasize the utilitarian aspect of university life and education. But the examples he gave are not exactly to the point. Oxford and Cambridge will never emphasize the technological side of their studies. On the other hand, even in the new Universities of Birmingham and Leeds, side by side with the technological studies they make provision for arts and sciences. And I am sure that the hon. Minister will not confine his attention to arts and sciences alone, but will also develop the cultural side of education. Unless this is done, the new University will not promote the cultural traditions of Andhra desa. He made another suggestion which appeared to me to be very sound. A separate university for the Andhra desa was established with the object of preserving, cultivating and developing the special Andhra culture. It was only with that main object that a new university on a linguistic basis was established. The Madras University was not able to make provision for the promotion of this distinct Andhra culture. When that is the case I do not

[Mr. S. Arpudāsawami Udayar] [28th January 1929]

understand the statement that all colleges outside the unitary university should be affiliated to the Madras University. The hon. the Minister for Education will kindly see that, besides the technological studies and arts and sciences at the headquarters, he makes provision for an external side to the new university, so that like the London University it may also discharge the affiliating functions. If the hon. Minister assures us that the new university, besides provision for the cultivation of arts, sciences and technological studies, will also make provision for the promotion of Andhra culture, and that no attempt will be made to hand over the colleges to the Madras University but that they would somehow or other be tacked on to the Andhra University, I think the apprehensions of the House will be allayed and the new university with the concentration of its higher courses at Vizagapatam will function very satisfactorily."

\* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I think the wholesome rule that a person who makes a promise must honour it applies not only to individuals, but even more so to Governments. I want to ask the hon. Dr. Subbarayan whether he did or did not say that he was prepared to adopt whatever place that might be recommended by the members of the Telugu districts and that he was prepared to accept their recommendation and act up to it. I am not referring to the minute of dissent which he wrote to the report of the committee, but to what he said before the appointment of the committee. I should like to know whether it is impossible to give effect to the recommendations of the committee, to concentrate on arts at Anantapur and on the technological side at Vizagapatam. Reference was made to the press communiqué recently issued. And if I followed the hon. Member the Vice-Chancellor of the Andhra University correctly, he created in my mind a doubt whether the Government would be prepared to act up to what was given expression to in that communiqué. Plainly I should like to know whether the hon. Minister will make himself responsible for permission being given to all the other colleges elsewhere to dissociate themselves from the Andhra University and be affiliated to the Madras University. I should like to know from the Government whether so far as they are concerned they will try to have that view accepted by the House."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Sir, I did not want to intervene in this debate, but seeing that so many hon. Members have been talking about Vizagapatam and Rajahmundry I wanted to see where Vizagapatam was. If it is the idea to abandon the federal type of the university and have a unitary type of university like the Annamalai University, we shall have to alter the scheme of the Act. If the university is to be of the unitary type and possess also in addition the affiliating functions, then its location should be at a central place. I find that Vizagapatam is not at the centre of Andhra desa. (The hon. Member had a copy of the map in the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Guide.)"

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" Is my hon. Friend referring to a document not placed on the Council table? "

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I am referring to a guide, a safe guide, to show that, if a selection is to be made between Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam, the former is a more central place."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" May I know whether it is drawn to scale? " (Laughter.)



28th January 1929]

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"It is not a matter for joke; it is a very serious matter. (Hear, hear.) The Andhra University must have a very suitable centre. Suppose we have to decide the question of the centre of the Madras University, will you select Mangalore as centre? (Laughter.)"

"To have selected Anantapur is really a joke on the part of the Select Committee. I think the selection of Vizagapatam is a greater joke than that of Anantapur. . . ."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"A point of order, Sir. I want to ask your ruling whether the hon. Member can say that the report of the Select Committee of this House is a joke." 4-45 P.M.

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I think it was a joke and it is now. I want to know if it is not a joke to select Vizagapatam as the centre."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member will not be in order to reflect upon the vote of the House. But in this case it is not the vote of the House that is referred to."

(A voice :—"He was a member of the Select Committee.")

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I was not a member of the Committee. I think what is really in the mind of the hon. Minister is to scrap the Andhra University Act and to have a new University altogether of a new type in Vizagapatam. Let him have it; if he has money that can be spared, if Vizagapatam can spare, as Annamalai, Rs. 20 or 30 lakhs, and if Government can spare Rs. 20 or 30 lakhs let us have an University at Vizagapatam. If the fundamental principle of the Andhra University Act is to have only one centre, I have to select Rajahmundry. Between Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam, Rajahmundry should be preferred. I will go further and say that between Rajahmundry and Bezwada, Bezwada should be the centre—never mind at what cost."

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Mr. President, Sir, my hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar raised the question whether the Government should not keep their promise. The Government had kept their promise. It is wrong to say that the Government promised that they would accept the verdict of the Select Committee. What I said was—I even now maintain it—that, if the Andhra Members came to an unanimous conclusion, I would accept that decision. But that, I find after two years, has not been found possible and that is the reason why I have come with my own amendment of Vizagapatam. If he had read the report of the Select Committee, he would have found that, in my dissenting minute, I even then said that I did not accept the decision of the Select Committee with regard to the choice of Anantapur as a centre. My hon. Friend knew, as well as I do, when he was my hon. Colleague on this side of the House, that from that time I have maintained that we should accept the decision of the Andhras as a whole. If they cannot come to a decision, the Government should find a solution. The present Government are trying to find a solution of the very tangled problem. The second question asked was. . . ."

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—"Mr. President, Sir, a point of order. It is whether the hon. the Minister who is the mover of an amendment to the clause just before the House is entitled to speak a second time on the same amendment."

[28th January 1929]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think the hon. Member was not in the House when I stated that the hon. Member's amendment became a substantive motion."

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Another question which my hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, very pertinently asked was whether the Government stick to their communiqué which was issued. That was not the final opinion of the Government. If he had read the communiqué aright, he would have found that it was to elicit opinion from all gentlemen concerned in the development of the Andhra University what should the ideal be which the Government should work up to. I feel as a Member of the Government that the ideal to work up to should be a unitary type of University. But many Andhra gentlemen feel that they have cultural unity of their own which ought not to be disturbed and that the Andhra colleges should have the benefit of being affiliated to the Andhra University. It is because I accepted that principle of the Andhras that I did not bring a Bill of my own but I had to move amendments to bring about at least concentration in one centre, i.e., Vizagapatam and to continue the other colleges in the Andhra desa being affiliated to the Andhra University. There is also the Bill of Mr. Nagan Gowda wherein he would like that Bellary should go out. There is also the amendment proposed by my hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayadu that Chittoor should be excluded. I have heard from some gentlemen that all the Ceded districts should be excluded from the purview of the Andhra University. I am willing to consider the Bill of Mr. Nagan Gowda on its merits so that, if the Ceded districts' opinion is such that they would like to continue to be affiliated to the Madras University rather than the Andhra University, I am sure that will be accepted also by other Andhra members because I do not think they want to force anybody to remain within the new Andhra University."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—" I move that the question be put."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that the question be put."

The motion was put and carried.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I put the amendment of Mr. Ramasomajayulu to the amendment of the hon. the Chief Minister to the vote of the House, to substitute the word ' Rajahmundry ' for ' Vizagapatam '."

The motion was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows :—

*Ayes.*

1. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao.
2. " S. Satyamurti.
3. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
4. " P. Anjaneyulu.
5. " J. A. Saldanha.
6. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.
7. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.
8. " K. V. B. Swami.
9. " D. Narayana Raju.
10. " K. Uppi Sahib.
11. " Mothay Narayana Rao.
12. " C. Obi Beddi.
13. " A. Parasurama Rao Pantulu.
14. " C. Ramasomajayulu.

15. Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib.
16. " P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu.
17. " A. Kaleswara Rao.
18. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
19. " L. K. Tulasiram.
20. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.
21. " K. Madhavan Nayar.
22. " B. Venkataratnam.
23. " A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
24. " Ramnath Goenka.
25. " R. Nagan Gowda.
26. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.
27. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
28. " P. Siva Rao.



28th January 1929 |

Noes :

- |                                                                        |                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks,<br>K.C.S.I., C.I.E.               | 32. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.                        |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad<br>Usman Sahib Bahadur, Kt.             | 33. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.                       |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir, C.S.I., C.I.E.                                    | 34. " W. P. A. Soundarapandya Nadar.                  |
| 4. " Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan<br>Nayan.                               | 35. " S. Subrahmanya Moopanar.                        |
| 5. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.                                       | 36. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.                          |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.                                         | 37. Mr. W. E. Smith.                                  |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan.                                                | 38. " F. E. James.                                    |
| 8. Mr. Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar.                                      | 39. " R. J. C. Robertson.                             |
| 9. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Bazul-ul-lah<br>Sahib Bahadur, C.I.E., O.B.E. | 40. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja.                        |
| 10. Mr. H. A. Watson.                                                  | 41. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar.                        |
| 11. " C. A. Souter.                                                    | 42. Zamindar of Kallikotta.                           |
| 12. " S. H. Slater.                                                    | 43. Mr. U. Ramaswami Ayyar.                           |
| 13. " A. McG. C. Tampoe.                                               | 44. " P. Q. Venkatapati Raja.                         |
| 14. " C. W. E. Cotton, C.I.E.                                          | 45. " Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib.                         |
| 15. " V. Ch. John.                                                     | 46. " K. B. Karant.                                   |
| 16. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.                                       | 47. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.                    |
| 17. " Syed Tajudin Sahib.                                              | 48. Mr. K. Koti Reddi.                                |
| 18. " H. B. Ari Gowder.                                                | 49. " K. P. Raman Menon.                              |
| 19. " A. Balakrishna Shetty.                                           | 50. " B. Ramachandra Reddi.                           |
| 20. " J. Bheemayya.                                                    | 51. Sir A. P. Patro.                                  |
| 21. " J. A. Davis.                                                     | 52. Diwan Bahadur P. O. Ethirajulu Nayudu.            |
| 22. " R. Foulkes.                                                      | 53. Mr. P. T. Rajan.                                  |
| 23. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.                                         | 54. " T. K. Chidambaramatha Mudaliyar.                |
| 24. " Mahmud Sahamnad Sahib.                                           | 55. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.                 |
| 25. " Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara.                                     | 56. Khan Bahadur S. K. Abdul Razack<br>Sahib Bahadur. |
| 26. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.                              | 57. Mr. Khadir Mohidin Sahib.                         |
| 27. Mr. Daniel Thomas.                                                 | 58. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami<br>Reddiyar.         |
| 28. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan Nambu-<br>dripad.                      | 59. Khan Sahib T. M. Moidee Sahib Bahadur.            |
| 29. Mr. K. Krishnan.                                                   | 60. Rao Bahadur F. Muniswami Nayudu.                  |
| 30. " N. Siva Raj.                                                     | 61. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa<br>Chettiyar.    |
| 31. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva.                                           | 62. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.                       |
|                                                                        | 63. Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.                       |
|                                                                        | 64. Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao.                            |

Neutral.

- |                                           |                                                  |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai, C.I.E. | 6. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.                     |
| 2. Mr. S. Venkiah.                        | 7. Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao.                    |
| 3. Rai Sahib M. Hampayya.                 | 8. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami<br>Mudaliyar. |
| 4. Mr. C. R. Reddi.                       | 9. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.                         |
| 5. " G. R. Premayya.                      |                                                  |

Ayes 28. Noes 64. Neutral 9.

The motion was lost.

\*The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The amendment of the hon. the Chief Minister is for the consideration of the House. While discussing that amendment the relative merits of Bezwada, Anantapur and Vizagapatam are for the consideration of the House.

"The Council will now adjourn and re-assemble to-morrow at 11 a.m."

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,  
Secretary to the Legislative Council.